

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

James Ray Walker,

Plaintiff,

v.

Koehn, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-02054-RFB-DJA

Order

Before the Court is pro se Plaintiff James Ray Walker's "declaration regarding appointment of counsel." (ECF No. 80). In his declaration, Plaintiff explains that, after the Court granted the Federal Public Defender's motion to withdraw as his counsel, Plaintiff "is unaware of who or what firm was designated to replace FPD." The Court liberally construes Plaintiff's declaration as a motion for clarification. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (explaining that a "document filed *pro se* is to be liberally construed") (internal citations and quotations omitted). It grants Plaintiff's request for clarification and explains that, after the Court granted the Federal Public Defender's motion to withdraw, the Court did not appoint replacement counsel. (ECF No. 75). So, if Plaintiff requests appointment of counsel, Plaintiff must file a motion for appointment of counsel.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's declaration (ECF No. 80) as one for clarification and **grants** it. Plaintiff must file a motion for appointment of counsel if he requests that the Court appoint him new counsel.

DATED: August 1, 2025,


DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE